DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 100 CG 020 840

AUTHOR Halls, Dolores M.; And Others

TITLE As Families Grow Older: Information for Family Caregivers. Final Report.

INSTITUTION New Mexico State Agency on Aging, Santa Fe.; New Mexico State Univ., Las Cruces. Inst. for Gerontological Research and Education.

SPONS AGENCY Administration on Aging (DHHS), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 87
GRANT 90-A0149/01; OHDS-90-AT-0149/01
NOTE 55p.; Paper presented at the Annual Scientific Meeting of the Gerontological Society (40th, Washington, DC, November 18-22, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - General (140) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Aging (Individuals); *Family (Sociological Unit); *Human Services; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Skill Development; *Training Methods; *Well Being; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

This document presents the final report of the "As Families Grow Older" project, a continuing education program for aging network service providers and family members in 23 counties throughout New Mexico which was designed to promote family well-being. It describes how the project, which was in operation from April 1986 through January 1987, trained 448 service providers and 273 family members in knowledge and skill development for promoting family well-being through workshops which focused on: (1) normal physical and psychological changes of aging; (2) intergenerational communication skills; (3) health promotion, including units on nutrition, physical fitness, stress management, medication management, and accident prevention; (4) legal and financial considerations; (5) community resources for elders; and (6) mutual support groups. The report contains a project abstract; a section on policy and program implications; a discussion of dissemination and utilization; an executive summary; and five chapters dealing with the evaluation procedure and results. A master bibliography, an agenda for a 2-day workshop, an evaluation form, the original combined summary evaluation results by county, and the follow-up combined summary evaluation results by county are appended. (NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED295100

FINAL REPORT

of

AS FAMILIES GROW OLDER (AGFO)

Information for Family Caregivers

Grant Number 90-A0149/01

TIGRE
(The Institute for Gerontological Research and Education)
New Mexico State University,
Dept. 3TG, P. O. Box 30001, Las Cruces, NM 88003

and

NEW MEXICO STATE AGENCY ON AGING
244 E. Palace Ave Fourth Floor, Santa Fe, NM 87501

JUNE 1987

CG 020840

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dolores M. Halls
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FINAL REPORT

of

AS FAMILIES GROW OLDER
(AFGO)

Information for Family Caregivers

Prepared by

Dolores M. Halls, Project Director
Stephanie J. FallCreek, Co-Principal Investigator - TIGRE
Gene Varela, Co-Prinicpal Investigator - NMSAoA

with
Christopher Benedict
Bertha Fabre-Lujan
Albert O. Galves
Carol Glassheim
Carol Jones
Bonna J. Schleusener
Jackie Stratton

for

TIGRE
(The Institute for Gerontological Research and Education)
New Mexico State University,
Dept. 3TG, P. O. Box 30001, Las Cruces, NM 88003

and

NEW MEXICO STATE AGENCY ON AGING
244 E. Palace Ave, Fourth Floor, Santa Fe, NM 87501

JUNE 1987

This project was supported, in part, by award Number 90-AT-0149/01, from the Administration on Aging, Office of Human Development Services, Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, D.C. 20201. Grantees undertaking projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their findings and conclusions. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Administration on Aging policy.

PROJECT ABSTRACT

"AS FAMILIES GROW OLDER" (AFGO):
Continuing Education for Promoting Family Well Being

The New Mexico State Agency on Aging, The Institute for Gerontological Research and Education and Cooperative Extension Service at New Mexico State University collaboratively developed and delivered continuing education programs for aging network service providers and family members in 23 counties throughout New Mexico from April 1986 through January 1987.

Workshops trained service providers and family members in separate educational programs to assist families with aged members in promoting health and well-being of all family members. Workshops addressed the following topics in relation to aging and well-being:

1) Normal Physical and Psychological Changes of Aging
2) Intergenerational Communication Skills
3) Health Promotion
   a. nutrition
   b. physical fitness
   c. stress management
   d. medication management
   e. accident prevention
4) Legal and Financial Considerations
5) Community Resources for Elders
6) Mutual Support Groups

Two manuals were developed. One entitled As Families Grow Older is for family caregivers. The other is a training manual for service providers.

The training in knowledge and skill development for promoting family well-being was presented to 448 service providers and 273 family members. A variety of teaching methods were used in an effort to appeal to a diverse audience. These included use of appropriate audio visual materials, guest speakers with expertise on a workshop topic, experiential group work and discussion, free dialogue between instructors and participants with stretch and refreshment breaks.

The project has increased the skills and involvement of service providers in responding to the needs of elders and their caregivers. The quality of care given by the caregivers has be improved and family health and well-being has been enhanced.

For more information contact Dolores M. Halls, Project Director, at The Institute for Gerontological Research and Education, New Mexico State University, (505)646-3426.

This project is supported in part by OHDS Grant 90-AT-0149/01

POLICY AND PROGRAM IMPLICATIONS

The AFGO project has dealt with the growing concerns surrounding the caregiving responsibility for elders by the family unit with particular emphasis on those faced by the Southwestern population. Specific policies for this project which responded to the special conditions of the Southwest included focusing on the "family" as the mutual caregiving unit rather than solely on the aged; adapting existing models to a multicultural and economically diverse population; and actively involving caregivers in the training experience of a continuing education model.

These policies were promoted by successfully achieving the following objectives:

1) developing a continuing education model, including a leader's guide and a family caregiver's manual focusing on the promotion of family health and well-being

2) focusing on the needs of caregivers themselves for knowledge and skills which strengthen the growth and development of mutual support within the family

3) presenting statewide continuing education on family caregiving for service providers in the aging network.

A major accomplishment of this project is that through the training provided by the continuing education model and the manual, the service providers are enabled to present additional workshops in each of the counties involved during and after the grant period. A cadre of family caregivers with enhanced capability to deal effectively with the consequences of aged family members upon the family unit will be available to assist service providers in delivering these programs. The two manuals can be used in a variety of settings and adapted to the special needs of each county for training in family caregiving.

The implications of this project are that the direct benefits that have resulted from the strengthening of family support systems through the improved family communication, increased knowledge and skills about aging, and health promotion have improved the quality of life for all family members. This project will provide a valuable model for replication in other multicultural populations and rural/urban areas. Improved communication and coordination of services for the elderly has been accomplished by the collaboration of state and area agencies on aging, program staffs, and extension home economists and family life specialists. All of the collaborators have been able to use the materials from the manuals on a continuing basis. Cumulatively, these factors combine to give communities and families with aged members the potential for improved communication, health and well-being.

DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION

A variety of dissemination activities have occurred throughout the project. We anticipate continued dissemination of information through the efforts of both TIGRE, the State Agency on Aging, and the Cooperative Extension Service. Extensive dissemination is being achieved on an ongoing basis through the AFGO manuals which were distributed statewide at each workshop. They were developed in order to enhance training in family caregiving, and to assist service providers in delivering additional educational programs in their counties.

Various organizations/agencies were included in the primary dissemination of the AFGO project abstracts, the workshop schedule and the list of primary contact persons in counties where workshops were scheduled. Some of these were:

- New Mexico Conference of Churches
- Baptist Convention of New Mexico
- New Mexico United Methodist Conference
- New Mexico Social Services Division county offices
- New Mexico Health and Environment Department
- New Mexico Association of Home Health Agencies
- New Mexico Senior Citizens Centers
- New Mexico Association of Retired Persons
- New Mexico Alzheimer's Disease and Related Disorders Association

In each county, dissemination of information has been an on-going project activity. Newspaper articles, radio announcements, and interviews for television and radio broadcasts have been used to announce workshop activities and related information. Flyers advertising the As Families Grow Older workshops were disseminated in each county to a list of service providers furnished by the County Extension Agent, as well as posted in churches, senior centers, service clubs, and other appropriate locations to invite caregivers and other interested people from the community.

The following presentations have been made to area organizations and professional conferences.

August 23, 1985 "Older Women's Issues: Family Caregiving" at the 3rd Annual El Paso Conference on Aging in El Paso, TX.

December 17, 1985 Overview of AFGO project presented to the Advisory Committee at the State Agency on Aging (SAoA) in Santa Fe, NM.

March 11, 1986 Update on AFGO project presented to the Advisory Committee at the State Agency on Aging in Albuquerque, NM.

March 12, 1986 "Reaching Family Caregivers" at the SAoA Quarterly Training Session in Albuquerque, NM.

June 17, 1986 "Reaching Family Caregivers" at the SAoA Quarterly Training Session in Albuquerque, NM.

August 26-28, 1986 "As Families Grow Older: Helping Family Caregivers" at the annual New Mexico Conference on Aging in Glorieta, NM.

September 2-5, 1986 "How to Give A Workshop for Family Caregivers" at the Southwest Society on Aging Annual Conference in Houston, TX.

September 24-25, 1986 "As Families Grow Older Training Workshop" in Las Cruces, NM.

October 11, 1986 "As Families Grow Older" for the Mariners Retreat at Holy Cross Retreat, Mesilla Park, NM.

October 24, 1986 "TIGRE and AFGO" at the New Mexico Public Library Association, Las Cruces, NM.

October 30, 1986 "The Golden Years: As Families Grow Older" at the Governor's Conference on Women, Las Cruces, NM.

November 19, 1986, a report on the AFGO Project at a workshop at the SAoA Quarterly Training in Albuquerque.

In addition to the presentations already concluded, a proposal for a discussion session has been submitted to the Gerontological Society of America for presentation at their annual conference in Washington D. C. in November 1987.

The evaluations for the original 23-county workshops were analyzed. An evaluation report was compiled and mailed to the primary contact people in each county. The follow-up evaluation analyses were also compiled and mailed to the same contact persons.

The variety of dissemination activities for this project has led to a large pool of participants for the program. The training of service providers through the AFGO workshops and manual will ensure the continuity of the program, as the information gained is incorporated into the service providers' work with families and the elderly in their community.

The Institute for Gerontological Research and Education at New Mexico State University will distribute copies of the AFGO manuals for reproduction and mailing costs.

AS FAMILIES GROW OLDER EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

New Mexico is the fifth fastest-growing state in terms of elders. The over-60 population grew by more than 72% between 1970 and 1985. More than a fourth of these elders live below the poverty-level. The elderly population is distinctly multicultural; 68% Anglo, 26% Hispanic, 4% American Indian and 1% Black. Most of the state is rural, with several very rural counties having an older population in excess of 20 %. The greatest growth among elders is found in Anglo in-migrants. This creates some special challenges for the aging network. For example, these in-migrants tend to be more affluent than native New Mexicans and also tend to be more sophisticated about using the available services and programs. On the other hand, these in-migrants often have left their family support systems when they moved to the southwest. This usually places the caregiving responsibility solely on the spouse (if one exists) or the human services system. For many years, among the native New Mexican populations, both perceived and actual responsibility for care for the elders has been located in the family unit. Increased longevity of elders, rural to urban population shifts, increased employment among women, and in many cases the gradual disintegration of extended family networks among subcultures has created particular stresses upon the family care system which historically has provided the majority of personal care for the elders.

The very rapid growth of New Mexico's older population indicated a need for effective support programs. This project was designed to address this culturally challenging condition through a continuing education model developed and delivered by the New Mexico State Agency on Aging, The Institute for Gerontological Research and Education (TIGRE), and the Cooperative Extension Service.

The four primary objectives of the project were as follows:

1) Develop a continuing education model, including a leader's guide and a family member's manual focusing on caregiving within the family unit. This model addressed the needs of service providers for knowledge and skills to promote family health and well-being among their clients or constituent populations.

2) Develop a continuing education model focusing on caregiving within the family unit, which responded to the needs of caregivers themselves, for knowledge and skills which strengthened growth and development of mutual support and well-being within the family.

3) Present statewide continuing education on family caregiving for service providers.

4) Present statewide continuing education on family caregiving to family members in families with older persons.

Workshops were designed in a two-day (ten and one-half hours) format to provide the continuing education. Day one (seven hours) was directed at family caregivers addressing such topics as: biological aspects of aging, psychological aspects of aging; intergenerational communication; health care; health promotion and disease prevention; special concerns of the caregiver; institutionalization; legal rights and financial considerations; community resources available to assist the family, and formation of mutual support groups. Day two (three and one-half hours), was offered to service providers to enable them to promote family well-being and to train them in the skills necessary to present similar workshops to additional caregivers and clients.

A total of 721 persons have attended workshops presented in 23 counties throughout the state of New Mexico. Of this statewide attendance 448 were service providers from the fields of social services, nutrition sites, senior centers, home health agencies, institutional care facilities, advocacy groups, public health agencies, mental health groups, and private sector health care personnel. Another 206 persons were family caregivers (including elders) who had primary responsibility for caring for aged family members. A total of 67 attendees were interested persons. In addition, a number of family caregivers and service providers who were unable to participate in the workshops have benefited by interacting with the participants, reviewing the instructional manuals, and in the case of several county communities, attending secondary workshops using our model and training materials.

Evaluation of the project consisted of three components:

1) Monitoring by TIGRE or State Agency on Aging staff of the workshop participants to identify the number of trainees served, their auspice (if service providers) or their role or relationship in the caregiving unit (if caregivers), and their attendance at the workshop (partial or complete).

2) On-site evaluation of the training by participants (both service providers and caregivers) was conducted to assess (a) participants overall rating, (b) extent to which they found the workshop helpful, (c) participants rating of the instructor's presentation, and (d) the value of the manual and materials. Additional comments were solicited regarding the most and least valuable topics, suggestions of improvement, and how they had learned of the workshop. Service providers were queried as to the type of service they provided to the elderly, and caregivers were asked to designate sex and age of the caregiver and sex and age of the care recipient within their family unit or caring situation. Of caregivers responding (105), ages ranged from 19 - 86. Females predominated with 87% while male caregivers represented only 13%. Care receivers were 69% female, 31% male and their ages ranged from 40 - 98.

(3) Follow-up evaluation with workshop participants at a later date, approximately 6 months, reassessed the same questions as the on-site evaluation and also requested information about subsequent caregiving workshops or mutual support groups formed as a result of workshop attendance.

Evaluation findings indicate (a) a large majority of the workshops received high ratings from the participants, 89%, (b) participants placed significant value on the knowledge gained, (c) there was substantial agreement by all participants on the value of the manual, and (d) a high level of interest in the program was indicated by both family caregivers and service providers.

While the follow-up evaluation reaffirmed the results of the initial evaluation it should be noted that response was very poor. This evaluation was done by mail after all workshops had been completed. Only 25% were returned making reassessment information limited.

On the basis of our experience in presenting the workshops in numerous communities, both rural and urban, we recommend that special attention be paid to the early selection of competent guest speakers, the timely and appropriate use of the media in attracting the target population, the creation of an environment that facilitates interaction among participants, and the use of a flexible instructional method to accommodate the needs and learning levels of the audience.

Program implications include:

1) Participants acquire new knowledge and competencies that improve quality of care administered to elders at both family and professional levels.

2) Caregiving can be an exceptionally isolating and

stress producing task for families and persons involved. Therefore, the assistance and support provided by the program, and awareness of resources within the community can minimize the strain of the caregiving responsibility. In addition, the development of relationships among the participants can promote formation of mutual help groups to provide ongoing support.

3) Collaboration between institutions of higher learning, agencies, and practitioners results in a high quality program.

In addition to meeting the original objectives of the AFGO project, a larger group of citizens have become better informed about aging concerns and more knowledgeable about the availability or lack of resources in their communities. Therefore, they are better able and more likely to become effective advocates on behalf of themselves and the growing older population.

AFGO has achieved its objectives of providing education on family caregiving for caregivers within the family unit, as well as service providers to the elderly. The development of a family member's manual which provides knowledge of coping skills and a leader's guide will facilitate replication of similar programs in other localities nationwide.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Chapter I	
Introduction	1
Chapter II	
Methodology	2
Planning	2
Format	4
Evaluation	5
Chapter III	6
Results	6
Results of First Evaluation	7
Results of Follow-up Evaluation	8
Chapter IV	10
Discussion and Implications of Results	10
Attracting Participants	10
Problems Encountered	10
Implications for Future Programs	11
Chapter V	12
Summary	12
Recommendations	14
Appendices	
Appendix 1 - Master Bibliography	A-1
Appendix 2 - Agenda - 2 Day Workshop	A-7
Appendix 3 - Evaluation Form	A-8
Appendix 4 - Original Combined Summary Evaluation Results by County	A-10
Table 1 - Overall Rating by Service Providers	A-11
Table 2 - Instructor's Presentation by Service Providers	A-12
Table 3 - Workshop Development by Service Providers	A-13
Table 4 - Value of Handbook by Service Providers	A-14
Table 5 - Overall Rating by Caregivers	A-15
Table 6 - Instructors Presentation by Caregivers	A-16

Table 7 - Workshop Development by Caregivers A-17
Table 8 - Value of Handbook by Caregivers A-18

Appendix 5 - Follow-up Combined Summary Evaluation Results by County A-19
Table 9 - Overall Rating by Service Providers A-20
Table 10 - Instructor's Presentation by Service Providers A-21
Table 11 - Workshop Development by Service Providers A-22
Table 12 - Value of Handbook by Service Providers A-23
Table 13 - Overall Rating by Caregivers A-24
Table 14 - Instructors Presentation by Caregivers A-25
Table 15 - Workshop Development by Caregivers A-26
Table 16 - Value of Handbook by Caregivers A-27

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

As Families Grow Older

As Families Grow Older (AFGO) was developed in response to a growing need in New Mexico. An amazing 72% increase in the New Mexico's over-60 population from 1970 to 1985 has generated concern about the care of elders. Increasing longevity has made the three, four, and five-generation family more common and retiree migration to the sunbelt continues to add more elderly people to the population. The family is the primary life-sustaining force for these elders, providing 80% of the necessary care. Now and in the future, the capacity of the family to help care for its older members is crucial.

The major goal of the AFGO project was to improve the quality of life for both caregivers and care receivers and to postpone or eliminate the need for institutionalization.

It is also vital that agencies dealing with the aged recognize and support family efforts to maintain elderly independence. Appropriate response to needs of elders and their caregivers enhances family health and well-being, improves quality of elder care and promotes optimally independent lives for elders in the community.

Chapter II

METHODOLOGY

Planning

A pilot series of fourteen statewide one and one-half day workshops for family caregivers to the elderly was conducted by TIGRE in 1984. The results of this pilot program documented a need for further training throughout New Mexico. On this basis, a proposal to expand the training and include a service provider component was developed, submitted and accepted by the Discretionary Grant program of the Office of Human Services in response to a request for caregiver training projects.

In order to fulfill the primary objectives of this project, a series of workshops for family caregivers and service providers to the elderly was presented in twenty three counties of New Mexico. These counties were selected as being representative of the state population by one or more of the following criteria:

- population density
- population composition by age
- rural isolation
- availability of a cooperative extention agent
- socio-economic composition of the area
- cultural ethnic composition of the population
- existence of community resource programs and services

In September 1985 and March 1986, planning meetings were attended by the Institute for Gerontological Research and Education (TIGRE) represented by the co-Principal Investigator and the Project Director and the Cooperative Extension Service represented by the Extension Assistant Program Director, the Extension Assistant Program director, Extension Service Specialist, and Extension Specialist, Home Economics and Community Development to collaborate on developing the master plans for the workshops.

Cooperative Extension Service has a stable organization within all New Mexico counties. Their employees have constant contact with individuals and families within the areas they serve. This network was used to help establish workshop sites and dates, to provide information about the AFGO Project, and to reach caregivers and service providers who would benefit from the training.

The methods Cooperative Extension Service uses are: volunteer leadership training, direct teaching, use of the media, extension homemakers, and other organizations.

Since the Cooperative Extension Agents were already acquainted with the population and resources peculiar to their locality, it was believed that they could do a more efficient job of organization and recruitment at the county level.

The project was designed to incorporate this well established statewide network of county agents into the program planning and presentation. Those counties that had Extension Home Economists who could help with the organization of the workshops were identified, contacted and recruited. In a few counties where there were no Home Economists, the Agricultural Agents acted as community liaisons.

A State Advisory Committee was formed and held their first meeting in December 1985. Besides project personnel, its members represented a cross section of the statewide aging network. These included the New Mexico Association of Aging Programs, New Mexico Human Services Department, New Mexico Health and Environment Department, representatives from each of the four Area Agencies on Aging, a state officer of the American Association of Retired Persons and the state chair for Alzheimer's Disease and Related Disorders Association. Collateral materials were distributed to orient committee members to the project. The project work plan was reviewed, and information and suggestions were solicited.

At the next Advisory Committee meeting in March 1986, drafts of the leader's guide and the caregivers manual, as well as the schedule of workshop training dates and sites were presented for input and approval.

The project staff also met with the Extension Home Economists and representatives from the state Area Agencies on Aging to prepare them for co-facilitating or sponsoring the county training workshops.

In conjunction with the writing of the service providers and the caregivers manuals, a master bibliography of caregiving materials was compiled. See Appendix 4.

A annotated bibliography of caregiving materials was also developed.

The final schedule of workshop dates and sites included 7 presented in Spanish and 17 given in English. Several of the workshops also had Native American attendees.

Format

The workshops were presented on two consecutive days. The first day's content was directed to the caregivers and contained information consisting of:

- Physical and psychological aspects of aging
- Techniques to improve intergenerational communications
- Instruction in safe transfer techniques
- General health promotion
  - Nutrition
  - Physical exercise
  - Stress management
  - Medication management
  - Accident prevention
- Special concerns of the caregiver
- Financial and legal issues
- Community resources
- Mutual support groups

The second day was a half day, focused on the service providers and presented a practical plan to help them conduct a similar workshop for caregivers at some future time in their community. The service providers were also expected to attend the workshop on the first day so that they could use the experience of attending a model workshop to develop their own to be presented during the grant period.

A representative sample of the two day workshop agenda is attached as Appendix 2.

Various local speakers were contacted to speak about the topics on which they were especially qualified. Some examples are: physical therapists, pharmacists, dieticians, personnel in agencies serving seniors and mental health counselors. The project director and the project trainer conducted the workshops and presented the other topics not covered by guest speakers.

Stretch breaks and snack breaks were built into the schedule to give participants an opportunity to refresh themselves and renew their concentration as well as socialize with the other attendees. Either the local AARP Chapter or the local organizer provided healthful snacks such as trays of fresh vegetables, fruits, cheese and fruit drinks in keeping with the emphasis on health promotion.

Each attendee at a workshop was given a manual for immediate and future reference. Caregivers were provided with the AFGO Caregiving Manual. Service providers received the Caregivers Manual and in addition, the Training Manual for Service Providers.

Evaluation

Evaluation forms for caregivers and service providers were distributed at the end of each workshop (see Appendix 3). A concerted effort was made to ensure that each attendee completed one but a number of participants did not. The results were compiled and tabulated for each workshop. With the completion of the workshop series project staff integrated the data into a statewide compilation.

Primary contact persons from each community received a summary report of the initial evaluations for their own information and possible use in planning future training for local caregivers.

Follow-up evaluations which addressed the same questions asked in the on-site evaluations were mailed to the service provider participants. Information about additional distribution of manuals and other training materials and subsequent caregiving workshops was also requested.

Follow-up evaluations were also mailed to participating caregivers. These included the questions asked in the on-site evaluation as well as whether or not they have used the information and material they received at the original workshop. They were also asked about the formation of support or mutual help groups

A follow-up training session for service providers was held in Las Cruces for two days in September 1986. The AFGO Project covered travel expenses for ten service providers from throughout the state to attend the training which was designed to give them technical assistance and encouragement to conduct follow-up workshops for caregivers and other service providers in their communities.

Service provider participants felt that this workshop gave them additional skills and information which would help them in developing training in their communities. Also, participants appreciated the opportunity for free exchange of ideas and mutual support.

Eight follow-up workshops were given in the period from November 1986 thru February 1987. Several communities incorporated materials from the AFGO manual into other service organizations and club meetings. Reports from predominently rural counties indicated that service providers used and distributed copies of the whole or appropriate sections of the manual in one on one counseling situations.

Chapter III

RESULTS

The influx into New Mexico of elder Anglo in-migrants, increased longevity of elders, rural to urban population shifts, increased employment among women, and the gradual disintegration of extended family networks among subcultures all combine to create stresses upon the family care system.

The AFGO project was developed to address this culturally challenging condition and results of the project will be outlined.

The four primary objectives of the project were as follows:

1) develop a continuing education model, including a leader's manual and a family member's manual focusing on caregiving within the family unit. This model addressed the needs of service providers for knowledge and skills to promote family health and well-being among their clients or constituent populations;

2) develop a continuing education model focusing on caregiving within the family unit, which responded to the needs of caregivers themselves for knowledge and skills which strengthened growth and development of mutual support and well-being within the family;

3) present statewide continuing education on family caregiving to family members in families with older persons;

4) present statewide continuing education on family caregiving for service providers.

To meet the first objective, an annotated bibliography was prepared on resource material and a two-part manual was developed and refined by project staff and Advisory Committee members. Part one, consisting of 17 pages, was designed for service providers and part two, consisting of 122 pages, was intended for caregivers. The manuals contained culturally, socially, and economically responsive training material for use in the AFGO workshops. Also included were three appendices: first, statewide, toll-free telephone numbers, second, statewide resources and third, resources by county. The manual's impact has been ongoing through replication for use in secondary workshops, agency training, and library placement as well as the sharing of contents by original

workshop participants with others in their respective communities.

The second objective, that of workshop development, was accomplished by identifying problems, both of family caregivers and service providers and developing an agenda which responded to those problems. Family members are usually considered natural helpers. However, they often lack awareness of the biological and psychological aspects of aging, methods of intergenerational communication, health care and disease prevention, or the community resources available to assist them.

The first day's workshop agenda in response to the third objective was designed to include these topics as well as other concerns of the caregiver, such as, institutionalization, legal rights and financial considerations. Attending across the state were 206 family caregivers. In most cases, these persons were kin by blood, marriage or members of an informal caregiving and receiving unit whose ages ranged from 19-86. Their care receivers ages ranged from 40-98.

Attendees were motivated by the desire to gain knowledge to better perform their task of caregiving and to locate sources of helpful materials and physical aid. An equally important need for emotional/psychological support was evidenced by the interest in the formation of mutual support groups.

Results of the First Evaluation

On a rating scale of 1, poor through 5, excellent, service providers overall rating of the workshops were: 5 excellent, 55%, 4 good, 33%; combined total 88%.

Service providers rated the instructor's presentation 5 excellent, 64%, 4 good, 23%; combined total, 87%.

Service providers reply to whether the workshop was helpful in developing a workshop for caregivers was rated 5 excellent, 48%, 4 good, 31%; combined total 79%.

Service providers in response to the value of the manual to their agency, 5 excellent, 69%, 4 good, 23.5%; combined total 92.5%.

Statewide attendance for service providers was 448. Fields represented were social services, nutrition sites, senior centers, home health agencies, institutional care facilities, advocacy groups, public health agencies, mental health groups, and private sector health care personnel.

On the same scale caregivers overall ratings of the workshop were: 5 excellent, 65%, 4 good, 24%, for a combined total of 89%.

Caregivers rated the instructors' presentations: 5 excellent, 72%, 4 good, 17%; combined total 89%.

Caregivers responses to being asked about the usefulness of the workshop for them answered: 5 excellent, 69%, 4 good, 23%; combined total 92%.

Caregivers rated helpfulness of the manual, 5 excellent, 79%, 4 good, 13%; combined total 92% (see Appendix 4, Tables 1-8).

Service providers tended to agree with caregivers on the value of the training manual and almost all of the topics. The area designated of least value by service providers was the Workshop Planning segment, perhaps due to a lack of advance understanding of the intended role for service provider participants, that of future workshop presenters at the county level.

In addition to the rated questions, there were some which asked for comments. To the question, "What was the most valuable topic for you?", service providers named Medication Management almost twice as often as any other. Physical Therapy was second with Nutrition, Community Resources, and Intergenerational Communication mentioned almost equally for third. Caregivers rated Physical Therapy first, Biological Aspects of Aging second and Medication Management third.

Other comments concerned satisfaction or dissatisfaction with various presenters, and with the physical conditions of the workshop site. Two common comments were about how much the participant appreciated the workshops and the manuals.

Many caregivers stated that the workshops were too short and that they hoped another one would be presented.

Results of the Follow-up Evaluation

The second evaluation forms were mailed to the service providers and caregivers several months after they had attended the workshops. The form was almost the same as the original but asked for additional information about the use of the manuals, plans for future workshop presentations and formation of support groups. Of the original 721 attendees, project staff was able to locate and mail the follow-up evaluations to 654 persons. Total follow-up evaluations returned were 160, or 25% of the mailing.

The overall results of the second evaluation were slightly below the original but confirmed the majority of ratings in the categories of good to excellent

Service providers overall rating of the workshop from good to excellent was 78%. Instructor's presentation was 78%, good to excellent; helpfulness of workshop in developing another workshop for caregivers, 57%, good to excellent; manual of great value to their agency, 69%, good to excellent.

Caregivers overall ratings of workshop were, 87%, good to excellent; rating instructor's presentation, 82%, good to excellent; rating workshops helpfulness, 92%, good to excellent; rating manual's helpfulness, 92%, good to excellent (see Appendix 5, Tables 9-16).

The fourth objective was addressed on day two of the AFGO workshops which was designed for service providers in the aging network, organizations and agencies which are directly involved in serving an elderly clientele. A continuing education model was presented which actively involved service providers with caregivers during the training experience enhancing capability to deliver future training.

The AFGO project had planned to reach a total of 570 individuals. Actually, a total of 721 persons attended workshops in 23 counties throughout the state of New Mexico. Of this statewide attendance, 448 were service providers, 206 were family caregivers (including elders) and 67, interested attendees.

To further encourage presentation of workshops and the development of mutual support groups throughout the counties, an additional AFGO Training Workshop was presented for ten service providers who seemed most motivated to present a secondary workshop in their respective communities.

As a result of this training, several workshops were developed and interest in mutual support groups was encouraged. A program which was developed in a largely rural county consists of one-on-one visitations in the homes of caregivers. At last contact, two more counties had tentative plans for workshops and a possible respite program. All indicated additional replication of manual material for agency training or for sharing with clients.

In summary, the workshops and the training received high ratings. The objective of providing education on family caregiving for caregivers as well as service providers to the elderly has been accomplished. Education to strengthen family support systems is continuing at the county level.

Chapter IV

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS OF RESULTS

The summary of results in the preceding section support program effectiveness in meeting objectives for education and training needs. Feedback shows activity and mutual support for family caregivers are ongoing both through better knowledge of techniques and resources available to them, and higher awareness of others in their community who share their dilemma. Also, interest has heightened in the professional communities statewide, fostering attention and creativeness among service providers to ensure improvement in existing programs and development of additional programs and resources at the local level.

Attracting Participants

To inform the potential participants about the availability of the program, a variety of methods were used. Professional members and service providers were involved in their own communities as guest speakers and as presenters. Persons in local senior service agencies publicized the information about impending workshops. Other methods included use of the media, through TV interviews and public service radio announcements, announcements and articles in newspapers and other local publications, and the mailing of flyers. These efforts resulted in a fair to excellent attendance in all counties.

Problems Encountered

There were a variety of responses to the 7 workshops being offered in Spanish. Attendance ranged from 100 in Rio Arriba County to no attendance in Anthony/Sunland Park which was one of 2 offered in Dona Ana County, the other was presented in English. This workshop was rescheduled with an attendance of 14 persons. In some of the communities in which a workshop in Spanish was scheduled, the majority of persons who attended preferred that the workshop be given in English.

The biggest problem in the early stage of development was within the administrative structure. Because of the hiring process at the state level, the .5 co-director position was changed to a full-time coordinator position. Although the salary range was lower, resulting in some savings, the workload of the Project Director was increased.

It became evident that there were caregivers in each area who would have liked to attend the workshop but could

not leave their care recipients. A belated effort was made to enlist the aid of the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) to organize respite care but the results were not uniformly successful owing to a late start. Access to respite care should be arranged by any communities planning to present caregivers workshops in the future.

Another problem that developed from hindsight was inconsistent information requested on sign-in sheets at the workshops. Some of the addresses were illegible, there was difficulty compiling address lists of caregivers and service providers to receive follow-up evaluations. AFGO staff spent considerable time attempting to verify addresses of workshop participants by contacting key persons in each of the 23 counties. Also, if the time lapse between the first and second evaluations was shortened, there might have been a larger return of second evaluations, thereby providing more accurate data regarding ongoing use of workshop information.

Some of the workshop arrangements were unsuitable. The room was too large or small, the temperature was too hot or cold. The seats were not comfortable and the acoustics were bad.

Implications for Future Programs

It is important to have an early analysis of evaluation data for adapting the program content and delivery to local needs. We made program adjustments as the program progressed. For example, more emphasis was placed on mutual support group development in later workshops. AFGO staff would have been more sensitive to needed change with more rapid evaluation analysis and input about areas that need improvement. Communities communities conducting similar programs may be more alert to some weaknesses in the design and be ready to make modifications to improve the program.

Chapter V

SUMMARY

The primary objectives of this project have been met and in some areas, surpassed. The manuals for both service providers and caregivers were developed and distributed statewide. The series of workshops were presented in the original 21 counties and 2 additional counties. Dona Ana and Santa Fe counties each had two workshops. Seven of the series were given in Spanish in counties with large Hispanic populations. Flyers and other materials were translated into Spanish to encourage participation and facilitate learning in these counties. Seven follow-up workshops have been given or are being planned.

Combined data for service providers and caregivers from the original evaluations:

Question: What was your overall rating of the workshop? N=455*

1 poor	2	3 fair	4	5 excellent
1%	1%	9%	30%	59%

Question: How would you rate the instructor's presentation? N=450*

1	2	3	4	5
.5%	1.5%	10%	22%	66%

Question: I think this workshop will be helpful to me in developing a workshop for caregivers (service providers) or to me (caregivers) N=136*

1	2	3	4	5
2%	1%	16%	27%	54%

Question: I think the handbook/manual will be of great value to my agency (service providers) or to me (caregivers) N=436*

1	2	3	4	5
.5%	.5%	6%	20%	73%

Combined data for service providers and caregivers from the follow-up evaluations.

Question: What was your overall rating of the workshop? N=156*

1 poor	2	3 fair	4	5 excellent
1%	1%	17%	34%	47%

Question: How would you rate the instructor's presentation? N=155*

1	2	3	4	5
1%	1%	14%	33%	51%

Question: I think this workshop has been helpful to me in developing a workshop for caregivers (service providers) or to me (caregivers) N=140*

1	2	3	4	5
3%	3%	19%	31%	44%

Question: I think the handbook/manual has been of great value to my agency (service providers) or to me (caregivers) N=145*

1	2	3	4	5
2%	3%	16%	30%	49%

* Reflects number of responses to questions. Not all respondents answered every question.

Based on both the original and the follow-up evaluations the AFGU project had a significant positive impact statewide. Both the service providers and the caregivers indicated that the workshop experience had been positive for them. The caregivers gave slightly higher ratings to the evaluation questions which may be because most of them had never had any kind of training in caregiving. The service providers were likely to be more familiar with the topics covered in the workshops and therefore more critical in their evaluations. (See Tables 1-15.)

Other comments on the original evaluations ranged from satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the instructors; guest presenters; physical conditions of workshop site including

room size, temperature and acoustics; amount of publicity and snack breaks.

Many service provider participants appreciated the availability of continuing education credits (CEU's). Those offered were for registered nurses, licensed practical nurses and university credit from New Mexico State University.

A three credit university course was devised from AFGO workshops, using the service providers and caregivers combined manual as a textbook. It is offered in Fall semesters at New Mexico State University.

Recommendations

1) Allow adequate planning time beginning at least six months before first workshop presentation

2) Select an advisory committee of ten to twelve competent persons representing a wide range of experience in community projects or organizations who are concerned about aging issues and who are enthusiastic about the project.

3) Solicit donations from local business and organizations to help defray costs, i.e. printing, mailing and refreshments.

4) Publicize the workshops well in advance, (one to two months) using all available public media and other appropriate private dissemination methods.

5) Form a speakers bureau of effective, informed persons to present information at community organization meetings.

6) Select knowledgeable presenters well in advance, (two to three months) of the workshop. Use a follow-up reminder or phone call one to two weeks before the workshop.

7) Incorporate relevant audio-visual materials into the presentation.

8) Try to pre-register participants to allow for more accurate planning.

9) Recruit volunteers from the community and service organizations to help with registration, distribution of materials and provision of healthful refreshments.

10) Select an accessible, comfortable workshop site with sufficient parking, adequate room size, preferably moveable comfortable chairs and tables for small group work, good ventilation, heating and/or cooling and good acoustics or a sound system.

11) Schedule the workshops at an appropriate time of day for your community to maximize attendance.

12) Make a check list of all materials and supplies including audio/visual aids.

13) Collect an evaluation at the end of the workshop to determine the effectiveness of the workshop.

14) Publicize results to interested persons and organizations.

15) Send letters of appreciation to all persons/organizations who contributed to the project.

See AFGO Training Manual for Service Providers for more details.

An AFGO Caregivers Workshop was presented in Santa Fe by the State Agency on Aging, Santa Fe Senior Citizens Program and Eight Northern Indian Pueblos Council in February 1987. Thirty-five caregivers attended; 97% gave an overall rating of good to excellent; 97% thought that the workshop was helpful; 97% rated the instructors' presentations good to excellent; and 90% thought that the handbook would be useful.

Reports are still being received by TIGRE about the continuation of benefits from the original workshops and the spin-off workshops. Requests for copies of the AFGO Manual have been received from New Mexico and other states.

It seems that the "ripple" effect of the project continues to expand.

APPENDIX I

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, R. F. (1981). Lifegain. Morristown, N. J.: Human Resources Institute.

American Association of Retired Persons. (1982). Information on Home Health Services: A Handbook about Care in the Home. Health Advocacy Services, Program Department, AARP.

Appelbaum, S. H. (1981). Stress Management for Health Care Professionals. Rockville, MD: Aspen.

Aronowitz, V., & Turner, S. The Healthwise Quality Cookbook. San Mateo County Senior Nutrition Program.

Aronson, M. K., Bennett, R., & Gurland, B. J. (Eds.). (1983). The Acting-Out Elderly. New York: Haworth Press.

Beaver, M. L., & Miller, D. (1985). Clinical Social Work Practice with the Elderly. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

Benson, H. (1975). The Relaxation Response. New York: Avon.

Biegel, D. E., Shore, B. K., & Gordon, E. (1984). Building Support Networks for the Elderly. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Breur, J. M. (1982). A Handbook of Assistive Devices for the Handicapped Elderly. New York: Haworth.

Brown, M. A., Coan, H., & Larson, R. W. (1983). Health, United States and Prevention Profile. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing.

Brubaker, T. H. (1985).Later Life Families. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Burger, S. G., & D'Erasmo, M. (1976). Living in a Nursing Home. New York: Ballantine Books.

Burnside, I. M. (1978). Working with the Elderly: Group Process and Techniques. North Scituate, MA: Duxbury.

Cadmus, R. R. (1984). Caring for Your Aging Parents. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Cantu, R. C. (1980). Toward Fitness: Guided Exercise for Those with Health Problems. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Chang, T. Y., Johnston, R., Mueller, J., & Swart, C. (1984). Impact of Major Public Policies and Programs on Natural Caregiving: An Appraisal (Grant No. 90AM0038/01). Washington, DC: Administration on Aging.

Porcino, J. (1983). Growing Older Getting Better: A Handbook for Women in the Second Half of Life. Reading, MA.: Addison Wesley.

Roberts, T. M., Tinker, K. Mc., & Kemper, D. W. (1979). Healthwise Handbook. Garden City, NY: Dolphin.

Rosenberg, M. (1977). Sixty-Plus and Fit Again. New York: M. Evans and Co., Inc.

Sargent, S. S. (Ed.). (1980). Nontraditional Therapy and Counseling with the Aging. New York: Springer Publishing

Savant, Inc. (1984). Material to support Design Work Session on Community Based Care Systems in the State of New Mexico. Kensington, Ma.: Savant, Inc.

Silverman, A. G., Brahce, C. I., & Zielinski, C. (1981). As Parents Grow Older: A Manual for Progam Replication. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, 48109.

Silverman, P. R. (1980). Mutual Help Groups: Organization and Development. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Skinner, B. F., & Vaughn, M. E. (1983). Enjoy Old Age. New York: W. W. Norton.

Sobel, D. S., & Ferguson, T. (1985). The People's Book of Medical Tests. New York: Summit Books.

Sorensen, K. C., & Luckmann, J. (1979). Basic Nursing. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders.

Springer, D., & Brubaker, T. (1984). Family Caregivers and Dependent Elderly. Beverly Hill: Sage.

Stephens, S., & Christianson, J. (1986). Informal Care of the Elderly. Lexinton, MA. : Lexington Books.

Switkey, B. (1982). Senior-cize: Exercises and Dances in a Chair. Washington D.C.: Senior-Cize Penthouse Suite.

Thurman, A. H., & Piggins, C. A. (1982). Drama Activities with Older Adults. New York: Haworth.

Tobin, S. S., & Lieberman, M. A. (1976). Last Home for the Aged. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Vickery, D. M., & Fries, J. F. (1981). Take Care of Yourself: A Consumer's Guide to Medical Care. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Chang, T. Y., & Swart, C. (1984). Natural Caregiving and Frail and Functionally Impaired Elderly in Wisconsin: A Profile (Grant No. 90AM0038/01). Washington, DC: Administration on Aging.

Chrisman, D. C. (1980). Body Recall. Berea, Ky.: Berea College Press.

Clark, C. C. (1981). Enhancing Wellness: A Guide for Self Care. New York: Springer Publishing.

Cleland, M. (1983). Senior Respite Care Program. 1015 N.W. 22nd Ave., Portland, Ore., 92710.

Cook, T., & Cohen, G. D. (Eds.). (1983). Physicans' Guide to the Diagnosis and Treatment of Depression in the Elderly. New Canaun,, Conn: Mark Powley Assoc.

Corinne, J. (1983). Aging, Living and Caring: A Handbook for Family and Friends. Texas Project for Elders, 2210 Maroneal, Suite 442, Houston, TX 77030.

Cretney, L. (1983). Family Caregiver Support Services: A Report (Grant No. 90AM0038/01). Washington, D.C.: Administration on Aging.

Dison, N. G. (1971). An Atlas of Nursing Techniques. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby.

Dobrof, R., & Litwak, E. (1981). Maintenance fo Family Ties of Long-Term Care Patients: Theory and Guide to Practice. National Institute of Mental Health.

DuGas, B. W. (1983). Introduction to Patient Care: A Comprehensive Approach to Nursing. Philadelphia: W. P. Saunders.

Duncan, T. (1982). Over 55: A Handbook on Health. Philadelphia: Franklin Institute.

FallCreek, S., & Mettler, M. (1984). A Healthy Old Age: A Sourcebook for Health Promotion with Older Adults. New York: Haworth.

Farquar, J. W. (1978). The American Way of Life Need Not Be Hazardous to Your Health. New York: W. W. Norton.

Gaarder, L. R., & Cohen, S. (1982). Patient Activated Care for Rural Elderly. Boise: Mountain States Health Corporation.

Garnet, E. D. (1982). Chair Exercise Manual. Princeton: Princeton Book Company.

Gilbert, J. G. (1977). The Paraprofessional and the Elderly. Greenvale, NY: Panel.

Graham, K. M. (1984). Developing Family-Centered Aging Services: Orienting a Rural Community. Mifflin - Juniata Area Agency on Aging, Inc., PO Box 750, Lewistown, Pa. 17044.

Gruber, F. (Ed.). (1985). Caring for Dependent Parents. New York: Research Institute of America.

Haber, D. (Fall, 1984). Church-based Mutual Help Groups for Caregivers of Non-Institutionalized Elders. Journal of Religion and Aging.

Haller, E. W., & Cotton, G. E. Nutrition in the Young and the Elderly. Lexington, Mass.: Callamore Press.

Heston, L. L., & White, J. A. (1983). Dementia. New York/San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.

Hooyman, N. R., & Lustbader, W. (1986). Taking Care: Supporting Older People and Their Families. New York: Free Press.

Jackson, J. J. (1980). Minorities and Aging. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Johnston, R. (1984). Policy Recommendations in Support of Natural Caregivers (Grant No. 90AM0038/01). Washington, DC: Administration on Aging.

Jury, M., & Jury, D. (1976). Gramp. New York: Penguin.

Kemper, D. W., Deneen, E. J., & Giuffre, J. V. (1981). Growing Younger Handbook. Boise, ID: Healthwise.

Klinger, J. L. (1978). Mealtime Manual for People with Disabilities and the Aging. Camden, NJ: Campbell Soup.

Koskela, R. N. (1983). Child Responsibility for Supporting Parents in Nursing Homes (Grant No. 90AM0038/01). Washington, DC: Administration on Aging.

Kraus, B. (1974). The Dictionary of Sodium, Fats, and Cholesterol. New York: Grosset and Dunlap.

Lee, P. R., & Lipton, H. L. (1983). Drugs and the Elderly: A Background Paper. San Francisco: Aging Health Policy Center.

Lewis, L. W., Weitzel, M. H., & Fuerst, E. (1979). Fundamentals of nursing: The Humanities and Sciences in Nursing (6th ed.). Philadelphia: Lippincott Press.

Loewinsohn, R. J. (1984). Survival Handbook for Widows. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Retired Persons.

Mace, D. R. (1983). Prevention in Family Services. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Mace, N. L., & Rabins, P. V. (1981). The 36 Hour Day. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.

Margolis, C., & Shrier, L. (1982). Manual of Stress Management. Philadelphia: Franklin Institute.

Mehrotra, C., & Randolph, S. M. (1984). Parent Caring: A Training Program for Families and Professionals. College of St. Scholastica, Duluth, MN.

Mehrotra, C., Randolph, S. M., & Dietrich, D. Instructional Manual for Parent Caring Programs. Vol. I: The Family Series. College of St. Scholastica, Duluth, MN 55811.

Middleton, L. (1984). Alzheimer's Family Support Groups: A Manual for Groups Facilitator. Tampa, FL: Suncoast Gerontology Center, U.S.F. Medical Center.

Montgomery, R. (1984). Family Seminars for Caregiving: Helping Families Help. Pacific Northwest Long-Term Care Center and Institute on Aging. Seattle, Wash.: University of Washington.

Mundinger, M. O. (1983). Home Care Controversy. Rockville, Ma.: Aspen Publication.

National Institute on Aging. (1984). Self-Care and Self-Help Groups for the Elderly: A Directory. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing.

Notelovitz, M., & Ware, M. (1982). Stand Tall: Every Woman's Guide to Preventing Ostereoporosis. New York: Bantam.

Older Women's League. (1984). Women Take Care: A Workshop on Family Caregivers (1984-6). Washington, DC: Author.

Park Nicolett Medical Foundation. (1984). Over 50 and Fit. Minneapolis: Greer and Associates.

Pawlosky, S. (1982). Trained Listeners Corps. Training Manual. Mental Health Services of Southern Oklahoma, 14 "K" St. SW, Ardmore, Oklahoma, 73401.

Pizer, H. (1983). Over Fifty-Five, Healthy and Alive. New York: Van Ostrand Reinhold.

Weininger, B., & Menkin, E. L. (1978). Aging is a Lifelong Affair. Los Angeles: Guild of Tutors.

Weisberg, N., Wilsler, R. (Eds.). Creative Arts with Older Adults. New York: Human Sciences.

White, D. L., & Neal, M. B. (1981). A Guidebook for the Family and Friends of Older Adults. Institute on Aging. Portland State University, P. O. Box 751, Portland, OR., 97207.

Wonn, M. F., & Bersell, D. L. (1985). Taking Charge: The Older Woman's Handbook. Albuquerque: New Mexico Commission on the Status of Women.

Zarit, S. H., Orr, N. K., & Zarit, J. M. (1983). Working with Families of Dementia Victims: A Treatment Manual. UCLA/USC Long-term Care Gerontology Center.

AS FAMILIES GROW OLDER

Clovis, New Mexico April 24 and 25, 1986

Dolores Halls, Coordinator

April 25 **CAREGIVING**

9:00	Welcome, Introductions, and Sharing Normal Aspects of Aging--Physical and Psychological
10:00	Physical Fitness (Jerry Jacobs)
11:00	Break
	Intergenerational Communication
12:00	Lunch Break
1:30	Medication Management
2:30	Nutrition (Lorraine Murray)
3:30	Break
	Stress Management
	Community Resources, Forming Support Groups,
	Participant Concerns, Evaluations
5:00	Adjournment

April 25 **PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT**

1:00	Welcome and Introductions
	Overview of Program Development
	Motivating Caregivers to Participate
3:00	Break
	Facilitating Group Process
	General Arrangements
	Implementing Program/Workshop Sessions
	Mutual Help Groups
5:00	Evaluations

As Families Grow Older Evaluation Form for Service Providers

What was your overall rating of the workshop?

1	2	3	4	5
poor		fair		excellent

I think this workshop will be helpful to me in developing a workshop for caregivers.

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree		not sure		strongly agree

What was most valuable for you?_____

What was least valuable for you?_____

How would you rate the instructor's presentation?

1	2	3	4	5
poor		fair		excellent

How might it be improved? _____

_____

I think the handbook will be of great value to my agency.

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree		not sure		strongly agree

Did you attend both days of the workshop? Yes No

Were there any topics you would you have liked to hear about and didn't?

_____

How did you find out about the workshop?_____

What kind of service do you provide to the elderly? _____

_____

Other Comments: _____

_____

Please use the back if you need additional space

As Families Grow Older Evaluation Form for Caregivers

What was your overall rating of the workshop?

1	2	3	4	5
poor		fair		excellent

I think this workshop will be helpful to me.

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree		not sure		strongly agree

What was most valuable for you?_____

What was least valuable for you?_____

How would you rate the instructor's presentation?

1	2	3	4	5
poor		fair		excellent

I think the handbook will be helpful to me.

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree		not sure		strongly agree

Were there any topics you would have liked to hear about and didn't?

_____

_____

How did you find out about the workshop?_____

Other Comments: _____

_____

_____

Sex of Caregiver M F Sex of Care Receiver M F

Age of Caregiver _____ Age of Care Receiver _____

Please use the back if you need additional space

A-9

APPENDIX 4

Tables 1 through 8

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS BY COUNTY

SERVICE PROVIDERS

Question: What was your overall rating of the workshop.

	Rating Scale					
County:	1 poor	2	3 fair	4	5 excellent	Total responses*
Bernalillo	1	1	6	12	12	32
Chavez	0	0	4	5	17	26
Cibola	0	0	1	1	6	8
Colfax	0	0	0	5	6	11
Curry	0	0	0	2	6	8
Dona Ana	0	0	1	7	8	16
Eddy	0	0	4	12	7	23
Grant	0	0	0	2	23	25
Guadalupe	0	0	2	6	2	10
Harding	0	0	0	2	5	7
Lea	0	0	2	6	3	11
Lincoln	0	0	0	2	0	2
Luna	0	0	0	1	4	5
Mora	0	0	0	2	6	8
Otero Day 1	0	0	0	4	8	12
Otero Day 2	3	2	3	4	2	14
Quay	0	0	0	6	3	9
Rio Arriba	0	0	0	0	2	2
Roosevelt	0	0	1	6	10	17
San Miguel	0	0	0	0	5	5
Santa Fe	0	0	3	5	8	16
Sierra	0	0	1	6	6	13
Socorro	0	0	0	2	11	13
Taos	0	0	0	0	5	5
Total # Respondents	4	3	28	98	165	298
Percentages:	2%	1%	9%	33%	55%	100%

* Reflects number of completed responses to each question. Not all respondents completed all questions.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS BY COUNTY

SERVICE PROVIDERS

Question: How would you rate the instructor's presentation?

	Rating Scale					
County:	1 poor	2	3 fair	4	5 excellent	Total responses*
Bernalillo	1	1	7	7	17	33
Chavez	0	0	2	3	21	26
Cibola	0	0	0	3	5	8
Colfax	0	0	1	4	6	11
Curry	0	0	0	3	6	9
Dona Ana	0	0	1	4	11	16
Eddy	0	0	2	9	12	23
Grant	0	0	1	0	23	24
Guadalupe	0	1	1	3	5	10
Harding	0	0	0	2	5	7
Lea	0	0	1	4	6	11
Lincoln	0	0	0	2	0	2
Luna	0	0	0	1	5	6
Mora	0	0	0	1	7	8
Otero Day 1	0	0	0	7	5	12
Otero Day 2	1	4	6	1	2	14
Quay	0	0	0	4	5	9
Rio Arriba	0	0	0	0	2	2
Roosevelt	0	0	2	1	14	17
San Miguel	0	0	2	1	2	5
Santa Fe	0	1	2	6	7	16
Sierra	0	0	1	1	10	12
Socorro	0	0	0	2	11	13
Taos	0	0	0	0	5	5
Total # Respondents	2	7	29	69	192	299
Percentages:	1%	2%	10%	23%	64%	100%

* Reflects number of completed responses to each question. Not all respondents completed all questions.

TABLE 3

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS BY COUNTY

SERVICE PROVIDERS

Question: I think this workshop will be helpful to me in developing a workshop for caregivers.

	Rating Scale					
County:	1 poor	2	3 fair	4	5 excellent	Total responses*
Bernalillo	2	1	4	10	14	31
Chavez	1	0	3	6	14	24
Cibola	0	0	0	2	6	8
Colfax	0	0	5	4	2	11
Curry	0	1	0	2	6	9
Dona Ana	0	1	1	7	7	16
Eddy	0	0	9	8	5	22
Grant	0	0	5	8	10	23
Guadalupe	0	0	4	2	3	9
Harding	0	0	1	2	4	7
Lea	0	0	7	2	2	11
Lincoln	0	0	0	2	0	2
Luna	0	0	0	1	5	6
Mora	0	0	1	1	6	8
Otero Day 1	0	0	0	4	8	12
Otero Day 2	3	1	5	6	0	15
Quay	0	0	0	6	2	8
Rio Arriba	0	0	0	0	2	2
Roosevelt	0	0	1	6	10	17
San Miguel	0	0	0	2	3	5
Santa Fe	0	0	2	5	8	15
Sierra	0	0	2	3	5	10
Socorro	1	0	3	0	9	13
Taos	0	0	0	0	5	5
Total Respondents	7	4	53	89	136	289
Percentages:	2%	1%	18%	31%	48%	100%

* Reflects number of completed responses to each question. Not all respondents completed all questions.

A-13

TABLE 4

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS BY COUNTY

SERVICE PROVIDERS

Question: I think the handbook will be of great value to my agency.

	Rating Scale					
County:	1 poor	2	3 fair	4	5 excellent	Total responses*
Bernalillo	0	1	0	9	21	31
Chavez	0	0	0	6	18	24
Cibola	0	0	0	2	6	8
Colfax	0	0	2	1	7	10
Curry	0	0	1	0	8	9
Dona Ana	0	1	1	4	10	16
Eddy	1	1	3	8	10	23
Grant	0	0	1	1	21	23
Guadalupe	0	0	0	6	3	9
Harding	0	0	0	3	4	7
Lea	0	0	2	2	7	11
Lincoln	0	0	0	1	1	2
Luna	0	0	0	0	6	6
Mora	0	0	1	1	6	8
Otero Day 1	0	0	1	2	8	11
Otero Day 2	0	0	4	5	5	14
Quay	0	0	0	1	8	9
Rio Arriba	0	0	0	0	2	2
Roosevelt	0	0	1	4	10	15
San Miguel	0	0	0	1	4	5
Santa Fe	0	0	0	6	10	16
Sierra	0	0	0	3	10	13
Socorro	0	0	0	2	9	11
Taos	0	0	1	0	4	5
Total # Respondents	1	3	18	68	198	288
Percentages:	.5%	1%	6%	23.5%	69%	100%

* Reflects number of completed responses to each question. Not all respondents completed all questions.

A-14

TABLE 5

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS BY COUNTY

CAREGIVERS

Question: What was your overall rating of the workshop.

	Rating Scale					
County:	1 poor	2	3 fair	4	5 excellent	Total responses*
Bernalillo	0	0	0	6	5	11
Chavez	0	0	0	0	2	2
Cibola	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colfax	0	0	0	0	0	0
Curry	0	0	1	2	6	9
Dona Ana	0	0	0	1	3	4
Eddy	0	0	0	0	8	8
Grant	0	0	0	0	7	7
Guadalupe	0	0	0	0	2	2
Harding	0	0	0	2	3	5
Lea	0	0	1	0	5	6
Lincoln	0	0	0	0	1	1
Luna	0	0	0	3	4	7
Mora	0	0	0	1	0	1
Otero Day 1	0	0	1	5	5	11
Otero Day 2	0	1	3	1	0	5
Quay	0	0	0	1	0	1
Rio Arriba	0	0	9	11	28	48
Roosevelt	0	0	0	0	3	3
San Miguel	0	0	1	0	5	6
Santa Fe	0	0	0	0	3	3
Sierra	0	0	0	3	4	7
Socorro	0	0	0	1	1	2
Taos	0	0	0	0	7	7
Total # Respondents	0	1	16	37	102	156
Percentages:	0%	1%	10%	24%	65%	100%

* Reflects number of completed responses to each question. Not all respondents completed all questions.

A-15

TABLE 6
SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS BY COUNTY

CAREGIVERS

Question: How would you rate the instructor' presentation?

	Rating Scale					
County:	1 poor	2	3 fair	4	5 excellent	Total responses*
Bernalillo	0	0	4	4	3	11
Chavez	0	0	0	0	2	2
Cibola	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colfax	0	0	0	0	0	0
Curry	0	0	1	0	8	9
Dona Ana	0	0	0	0	4	4
Eddy	0	0	0	0	8	8
Grant	0	0	0	0	8	8
Guadalupe	0	0	0	0	2	2
Harding	0	0	0	1	4	5
Lea	0	0	1	0	5	6
Lincoln	0	0	0	0	1	1
Luna	0	0	0	2	4	6
Mora	0	0	0	2	7	9
Otero Day 1	0	0	0	5	6	11
Otero Day 2	0	1	2	1	1	5
Quay	0	0	0	1	0	1
Rio Arriba	0	0	9	9	30	43
Roosevelt	0	0	0	0	3	3
San Miguel	0	0	0	0	6	6
Santa Fe	0	0	0	0	3	3
Sierra	0	0	0	2	5	7
Socorro	0	0	0	1	1	2
Taos	0	0	0	0	7	7
Total # Respondents	0	1	17	28	118	164
Percentages:	0%	1%	10%	17%	72%	100%

* Reflects number of completed responses to each question. Not all respondents completed all questions.

A-16

TABLE 7

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS BY COUNTY

CAREGIVERS

Question: I think this workshop will be helpful to me.

	Rating Scale					
County:	1 poor	2	3 fair	4	5 excellent	Total responses*
Bernalillo	0	0	0	7	4	11
Chavez	0	0	0	0	2	2
Cibola	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colfax	0	0	0	0	0	0
Curry	0	1	0	2	6	9
Dona Ana	0	0	0	2	2	4
Eddy	0	0	0	2	6	3
Grant	0	0	0	3	5	8
Guadalupe	0	0	0	0	2	2
Harding	0	0	0	1	4	5
Lea	0	0	0	2	4	6
Lincoln	0	0	0	0	1	1
Luna	0	0	0	3	4	7
Mora	1	0	0	0	0	1
Otero Day 1	0	0	0	2	5	7
Otero Day 2	0	0	3	0	0	3
Quay	0	0	0	1	0	1
Rio Arriba	0	0	5	9	34	48
Roosevelt	0	0	0	0	3	3
San Miguel	0	0	0	0	6	6
Santa Fe	0	0	0	1	2	3
Sierra	0	0	1	0	6	7
Socorro	0	0	0	0	2	2
Taos	0	0	0	0	7	7
Total # Respondents	1	1	9	35	105	151
Percentages:	1%	1%	6%	23%	69%	100%

* Reflects number of completed responses to each question. Not all respondents completed all questions.

A-17

TABLE 8

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS BY COUNTY

CAREGIVERS

Question: I think the handbook will be helpful to me.

	Rating Scale					
County:	1 poor	2	3 fair	4	5 excellent	Total responses*
Bernalillo	0	0	1	4	6	11
Chavez	0	0	0	0	2	2
Cibola	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colfax	0	0	0	0	0	0
Curry	1	0	1	3	4	9
Dona Ana	0	0	1	2	1	4
Eddy	0	0	0	0	8	8
Grant	0	0	0	2	6	8
Guadalupe	0	0	0	0	2	2
Harding	0	0	0	1	4	5
Lea	0	0	0	1	5	6
Lincoln	0	0	0	0	1	1
Luna	0	0	1	1	4	6
Mora	0	0	1	0	0	1
Otero Day 1	0	0	0	1	6	7
Otero Day 2	0	0	1	0	3	4
Quay	0	0	0	0	1	1
Rio Arriba	0	0	3	4	40	47
Roosevelt	0	0	1	0	2	3
San Miguel	0	0	0	0	6	6
Santa Fe	0	0	0	1	2	3
Sierra	0	0	0	0	7	7
Socorro	0	0	0	0	2	2
Taos	0	0	0	0	7	7
Total # Respondents	1	0	10	20	119	150
Percentages:	1%	0%	7%	13%	79%	100%

* Reflects number of completed responses to each question. Not all respondents completed all questions.

APPENDIX 5

Tables 9 through 16

TABLE 9

SUMMARY OF FOLLOW-UP EVALUATIONS BY COUNTY

SERVICE PROVIDERS

Question: What was your overall rating of the workshop.

	Rating Scale					
County:	1 poor	2	3 fair	4	5 excellent	Total responses*
Bernalillo	1	0	3	2	1	7
Chaves	0	0	0	2	3	5
Cibola	0	0	1	0	1	2
Colfax	0	0	1	2	0	3
Curry	0	0	0	1	1	2
Dona Ana	0	0	0	2	2	4
Eddy	0	0	1	5	0	7
Grant	0	0	0	1	2	3
Guadalupe	0	0	1	4	2	7
Harding	0	0	0	1	3	4
Lea	0	0	1	3	1	5
Lincoln	0	0	0	0	0	0
Luna	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mora	0	0	0	0	3	3
Otero Day 1 and 2	0	0	2	3	1	6
Quay	0	0	0	2	0	2
Rio Arriba	0	0	1	0	0	1
Roosevelt	0	0	0	2	1	3
San Miguel	0	0	0	0	2	2
Santa Fe	0	0	2	2	2	6
Sierra	0	1	3	2	1	7
Socorro	0	0	1	0	4	5
Taos	0	0	1	0	3	4
Total # Respondents	1	1	18	35	33	88
Percentages:	1%	1%	20%	40%	38%	100%

* Reflects number of completed responses to each question. Not all respondents completed all questions.

A-20

TABLE 10

SUMMARY OF FOLLOW-UP EVALUATIONS BY COUNTY

SERVICE PROVIDERS

Question: How would you rate the instructor's presentation?

	Rating Scale					
County:	1 poor	2	3 fair	4	5 excellent	Total responses*
Bernalillo	0	1	3	1	3	8
Chaves	0	0	2	0	3	5
Cibola	0	0	0	1	1	2
Colfax	0	0	0	1	2	3
Curry	0	0	0	1	1	2
Dona Ana	0	0	0	2	2	4
Eddy	0	0	0	5	2	7
Grant	0	0	0	1	2	3
Guadalupe	0	0	1	4	2	7
Harding	0	0	1	1	2	4
Lea	0	0	1	2	1	4
Lincoln	0	0	0	0	0	0
Luna	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mora	0	0	0	0	3	3
Otero Day 1 and 2	0	0	2	4	0	6
Quay	0	0	0	2	0	2
Rio Arriba	0	0	1	0	0	1
Roosevelt	0	0	0	2	1	3
San Miguel	0	0	0	0	2	2
Santa Fe	0	0	1	3	2	6
Sierra	1	0	2	2	2	7
Socorro	0	0	1	0	3	4
Taos	0	0	0	1	3	4
Total # Respondents	1	1	15	33	37	87
Percentages:	1%	1%	20%	40%	38%	100%

* Reflects number of completed responses to each question. Not all respondents completed all questions.

A-21

TABLE 11

SUMMARY OF FOLLOW-UP EVALUATIONS BY COUNTY

SERVICE PROVIDERS

Question: I think this workshop will be helpful to me in developing a workshop for caregivers.

	Rating Scale					
County:	1 poor	2	3 fair	4	5 excellent	Total responses*
Bernalillo	0	0	2	3	2	7
Chaves	0	0	0	1	3	4
Cibola	0	0	1	1	0	2
Colfax	0	1	2	0	0	3
Curry	0	0	1	0	0	1
Dona Ana	1	0	0	2	0	3
Eddy	1	1	4	1	0	7
Grant	0	0	1	1	1	3
Guadalupe	0	0	2	3	2	7
Harding	0	0	1	1	1	3
Lea	0	0	2	1	1	4
Lincoln	0	0	0	0	0	0
Luna	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mora	0	0	1	1	0	2
Otero Day 1 and 2	0	1	1	2	2	6
Quay	0	0	2	0	0	2
Rio Arriba	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roosevelt	0	0	1	1	1	3
San Miguel	0	0	0	0	2	2
Santa Fe	0	0	1	2	0	3
Sierra	1	1	3	1	0	6
Socorro	0	0	0	0	4	4
Taos	0	0	0	1	1	2
Total # Respondents	3	4	25	22	20	74
Percentages:	4%	5%	34%	30%	27%	100%

* Reflects number of completed responses to each question. Not all respondents completed all questions.

TABLE 12

SUMMARY OF FOLLOW-UP EVALUATIONS BY COUNTY

SERVICE PROVIDERS

Question: I think the handbook will be of great value to my agency.

	Rating Scale					
County:	1 poor	2	3 fair	4	5 excellent	Total responses*
Bernalillo	1	0	3	2	1	7
Chaves	0	0	0	3	1	4
Cibola	0	0	0	0	2	2
Colfax	0	1	1	0	1	3
Curry	0	0	0	1	0	1
Dona Ana	1	0	1	1	0	3
Eddy	0	1	2	3	0	6
Grant	0	0	0	2	1	3
Guadalupe	0	0	2	2	2	6
Harding	0	0	1	1	2	4
Lea	0	1	2	0	1	4
Lincoln	0	0	0	0	0	0
Luna	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mora	0	0	0	1	2	3
Otero Day 1 and 2	0	1	2	1	1	5
Quay	0	0	0	1	0	1
Rio Arriba	0	0	0	0	1	1
Roosevelt	0	0	0	1	2	3
San Miguel	0	0	0	1	1	2
Santa Fe	0	0	0	2	3	5
Sierra	0	0	4	1	1	6
Socorro	0	0	0	0	5	5
Taos	0	0	0	2	1	3
Total # Respondents	2	4	18	25	28	77
Percentages:	3%	5%	23%	35%	34%	100%

* Reflects number of completed responses to each question. Not all respondents completed all questions.

TABLE 13

SUMMARY OF FOLLOW UP EVALUATIONS BY COUNTY

CAREGIVERS

Question: What was your overall rating of the workshop.

	Rating Scale					
County:	1 poor	2	3 fair	4	5 excellent	Total responses*
Bernalillo	0	0	0	0	2	2
Chaves	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cibola	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colfax	0	0	0	0	0	0
Curry	0	0	0	2	1	3
Dona Ana	0	0	0	1	1	2
Eddy	0	0	0	1	5	6
Grant	0	0	0	2	8	10
Guadalupe	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harding	0	0	0	1	1	2
Lea	0	0	1	1	0	2
Lincoln	0	0	0	0	1	1
Luna	0	0	0	0	5	5
Mora	0	0	0	0	0	0
Otero Day 1 and 2	0	0	0	1	0	1
Quay	0	0	0	1	0	1
Rio Arriba	0	0	6	3	8	17
Roosevelt	0	0	0	0	3	3
San Miguel	0	0	1	1	3	5
Santa Fe	0	0	1	1	1	3
Sierra	0	0	0	2	1	3
Socorro	0	0	0	1	0	1
Taos	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total # Respondents	0	0	9	18	40	67
Percentages:	0%	0%	13%	27%	60%	100%

* Reflects number of completed responses to each question. Not all respondents completed all questions.

TABLE 14

SUMMARY OF FOLLOW-UP EVALUATIONS BY COUNTY

CAREGIVERS

Question: How would you rate the instructor' presentation?

	Rating Scale					
County:	1 poor	2	3 fair	4	5 excellent	Total responses*
Bernalillo	0	0	0	0	2	2
Chaves	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cibola	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colfax	0	0	0	0	0	0
Curry	0	0	0	1	2	3
Dona Ana	0	0	0	2	0	2
Eddy	0	0	0	1	5	6
Grant	0	0	0	2	8	10
Guadalupe	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harding	0	0	0	0	2	2
Lea	0	0	0	2	0	2
Lincoln	0	0	0	0	1	1
Luna	0	0	0	1	4	5
Mora	0	0	0	0	0	0
Otero Day 1 and 2	0	0	0	0	1	1
Quay	0	0	0	0	1	1
Rio Arriba	0	1	6	2	8	17
Roosevelt	0	0	0	0	3	3
San Miguel	0	0	0	2	3	5
Santa Fe	0	0	1	1	1	3
Sierra	0	0	0	3	1	4
Socorro	0	0	0	1	0	1
Taos	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total # Respondents	0	1	7	18	42	68
Percentages:	0%	1%	11%	26%	62%	100%

* Reflects number of completed responses to each question. Not all respondents completed all questions.

TABLE 15

SUMMARY OF FOLLOW-UP EVALUATIONS BY COUNTY

CAREGIVERS

Question: I think this workshop will be helpful to me.

	Rating Scale					
County:	1 poor	2	3 fair	4	5 excellent	Total responses*
Bernalillo	0	0	0	1	1	2
Chaves	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cibola	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colfax	0	0	0	0	0	0
Curry	0	0	0	1	2	3
Dona Ana	0	0	0	1	1	2
Eddy	0	0	0	1	5	6
Grant	0	0	1	5	3	9
Guadalupe	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harding	0	0	0	1	1	2
Lea	0	0	0	1	1	2
Lincoln	0	0	0	0	1	1
Luna	0	0	0	1	4	5
Mora	0	0	0	0	0	0
Otero Day 1 and 2	0	0	0	1	0	1
Quay	0	0	0	0	1	1
Rio Arriba	1	0	0	6	10	17
Roosevelt	0	0	0	0	3	3
San Miguel	0	0	0	1	4	5
Santa Fe	0	0	0	1	2	3
Sierra	0	0	1	0	2	3
Socorro	0	0	0	0	1	1
Taos	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total # Respondents	1	0	2	21	42	66
Percentages:	1%	0%	3%	32%	64%	100%

* Reflects number of completed responses to each question. Not all respondents completed all questions.

TABLE 16

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS BY COUNTY

CAREGIVERS

Question: I think the handbook will be helpful to me.

	Rating Scale					
County:	1 poor	2	3 fair	4	5 excellent	Total responses*
Bernalillo	0	0	1	4	6	11
Chavez	0	0	0	0	2	2
Cibola	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colfax	0	0	0	0	0	0
Curry	1	0	1	3	4	9
Dona Ana	0	0	1	2	1	4
Eddy	0	0	0	0	8	8
Grant	0	0	0	2	6	8
Guadalupe	0	0	0	0	2	2
Harding	0	0	0	1	4	5
Lea	0	0	0	1	5	6
Lincoln	0	0	0	0	1	1
Luna	0	0	1	1	4	6
Mora	0	0	1	0	0	1
Otero Day 1	0	0	0	1	6	7
Otero Day 2	0	0	1	0	3	4
Quay	0	0	0	0	1	1
Rio Arriba	0	0	3	4	40	47
Roosevelt	0	0	1	0	2	3
San Miguel	0	0	0	0	6	6
Santa Fe	0	0	0	1	2	3
Sierra	0	0	0	0	7	7
Socorro	0	0	0	0	2	2
Taos	0	0	0	0	7	7
Total # Respondents	1	0	10	20	119	150
Percentages:	1%	0%	7%	13%	79%	100%

* Reflects number of completed responses to each question. Not all respondents completed all questions.

A-27